



NAEP 2005 Reading Report for Utah

Released: October 19, 2005

This report provides selected results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for Utah's public school students at grades 4 and 8. Beginning in 1992, reading has been assessed in six different years at the state level (at grade 4 in 1992 and 1994, and at both grades 4 and 8 in 1998, 2002, 2003, and 2005).

NAEP is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment that demonstrates what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. NAEP first started tracking national performance in 1969. Beginning in 1992, NAEP conducted assessments for the individual states. A key role of State-by-State NAEP is assisting in evaluating the conditions and progress of student achievement at grades four and eight. The advantage of NAEP is that it allows comparison of results from one state with those of another, or with results for the rest of the nation. NAEP provides a line of evidence for states that can help answer such questions as: How are we doing on student achievement over time? How does our trends compare to the nation over time?

NAEP is a project of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). For more information about the assessment, see *The Nation's Report Card, Reading 2005*, which is available on the NAEP website along with the full set of national and state results in an interactive database (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>). Released test questions, scoring guides, and question-level performance data are also available on the website.

K E Y F I N D I N G S F O R 2 0 0 5

Grade 4:

- The average reading score for students in Utah was 221. This was not significantly different from that in 1992 (220) and was not significantly different from that in 2003 (219).
- Utah's average score (221) was higher than that of the nation's public schools (217).
- The percentage of students in Utah who performed at or above *Proficient* was 34 percent. This was greater than that in 1992 (30 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2003 (32 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* was greater than that for the nation's public schools (30 percent).
- The percentage of students in Utah who performed at or above *Basic* was 68 percent. This was not significantly different from that in 1992 (67 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2003 (66 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* was greater than that for the nation's public schools (62 percent).

Grade 8:

- The average reading score for students in Utah was 262. This was not significantly different from that in 1998 (263) and was lower than that in 2003 (264).
- Utah's average score (262) was not significantly different from that of the nation's public schools (260).
- The percentage of students in Utah who performed at or above *Proficient* was 29 percent. This was not significantly different from that in 1998 (31 percent) and was not significantly different from that in 2003 (32 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* was not significantly different from that for the nation's public schools (29 percent).
- The percentage of students in Utah who performed at or above *Basic* was 73 percent. This was smaller than that in 1998 (77 percent) and was smaller than that in 2003 (76 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Basic* was greater than that for the nation's public schools (71 percent).

The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has provided software that generated user-selectable data, statistical significance test result statements, and technical descriptions of the NAEP assessments for this report. Content may be added or edited by states or other jurisdictions. This document, therefore, is not an official publication of the National Center for Education Statistics.

Introduction

What Was Assessed?

The content for each NAEP assessment is determined by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). The objectives for each NAEP assessment are described in a "framework," a document that delineates the important content and process areas to be measured, as well as the types of questions to be included in the assessment. The development process for reading required the active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, subject-matter specialists, local school administrators, parents, and members of the general public. The reading framework is available on the NAGB website (http://www.nagb.org/pubs/r_framework_05/761507-ReadingFramework.pdf).

The reading framework for the 1992 and 1994 reading assessments also guided the 1998, 2000 (national grade 4 only), 2002, 2003, and 2005 assessments. This framework was developed under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), directed by NAGB. In 2002, the framework was updated to provide more explicit detail regarding the assessment design. In the process, some of the terms used to describe elements of the reading assessment were altered slightly. It should be noted, however, that these alterations do not represent a change in the content or design of the NAEP reading assessment.

The framework is founded on a body of research from the field of education that defines reading as an interactive and constructive process involving the reader, the text, and the context of the reading experience. Reading involves the development of an understanding of text, thinking about the text in different ways, and using a variety of text types for different purposes.

Recognizing that readers vary their approach to reading different texts, the framework specifies the assessment of reading in three contexts: reading for literary experience, reading to gain information, and reading to perform a task. Each context for reading is associated with a range of different types of texts that are included in the NAEP reading assessment. All three contexts for reading are assessed at grades 8 and 12, but reading to perform a task is not assessed at grade 4.

As readers attempt to develop an understanding of a text, they focus on general topics or themes, interpret and integrate ideas, make connections to background knowledge and experiences, and examine the content and structure of the text. The framework accounts for these different approaches to understanding text by specifying four "aspects of reading" that represent the types of comprehension questions asked of students. All four aspects of reading are assessed at all three grades within each context for reading. The reading framework specifies the percentage distribution of questions by grade level for each of the contexts for and aspects of reading.

The assessment contains reading materials that were drawn from sources commonly available to students both in and out of the school environment. These authentic materials were considered to be representative of students' typical reading experiences. Each student in the state assessment was asked to complete two 25-minute sections, each consisting of a reading passage and associated comprehension questions. A combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions was used to assess students' understanding of the passages. Released NAEP reading passages and questions, along with student performance data by state, are available on the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/itmrsl/>).

Who Was Assessed?

Fifty-two jurisdictions participated in NAEP in 2005: the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity Schools (domestic and overseas). The target sample for each state or other jurisdiction was approximately 100 schools at each grade tested and approximately 3,000 students for each subject at each grade, except in small or sparsely populated jurisdictions.

The sample of schools and students was chosen in a two-stage sampling process. First, the sample of schools was selected by probability sampling methods. Then, within the participating schools, random samples of students were chosen.

Beginning in 2002, the national sample was obtained by aggregating the samples from each state. The national results include the results from the states and from a sample of private schools, weighted appropriately to represent the U.S. student population. Only public schools, however, are included in the state reports.

The overall participation rates for schools and students must meet guidelines established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) in order for assessment results to be reported publicly. Participation rates before substitution needed to be at least 80 percent for schools and at least 85 percent for students in each subject and grade. Participation rates for the 2005 reading assessment are available at the NAEP website (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/sampledesign.asp>).

How Is Student Reading Performance Reported?

The results of student performance on the NAEP assessments are reported for various groups of students (e.g., fourth-grade female students or students who took the assessment in a particular year). NAEP does not produce scores for individual students, nor does it report scores for schools or for school districts. Some large urban districts, however, have voluntarily participated in the assessment on a trial basis and were sampled as states were sampled. Reading performance for groups of students is reported in two ways: as average scale scores and as achievement levels.

Scale Scores: Student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500 and is linked to the corresponding scales in 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2003. Subscales were created to reflect performance on each of the contexts for reading defined in the NAEP reading framework.

An overall composite scale was developed by weighting each of the reading subscales for the grade (two at grade 4 and three at grade 8), based on its relative importance in the framework. This composite scale is the metric used to present the average scale scores and selected percentiles used in NAEP reports.

Achievement Levels: Student reading performance is also reported in terms of three achievement levels—*Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Results based on achievement levels are expressed in terms of the percentage of students who attained each level. The three achievement levels are defined as follows:

- *Basic*: This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.
- *Proficient*: This level represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.
- *Advanced*: This level signifies superior performance.

The achievement levels are cumulative. Therefore, students performing at the *Proficient* level also display the competencies associated with the *Basic* level, and students at the *Advanced* level demonstrate the competencies associated with both the *Basic* and the *Proficient* levels.

The achievement levels are performance standards adopted by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) as part of its statutory responsibilities mandated by Congress. The levels represent collective judgments of what students should know and be able to do for each grade tested. They are based on recommendations made by broadly representative panels of classroom teachers, education specialists, and members of the general public from throughout the United States. As provided by law, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), upon review of congressionally mandated evaluations of NAEP, has determined that the achievement levels are to be used on a trial basis until it is determined that they are "reasonable, valid, and informative to the public." (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L., 107-110, 115 Stat.1425 [2002]). However, both NCES and NAGB believe these performance standards are useful for understanding trends in student achievement. They have been widely used by national and state officials as a common yardstick for academic performance. The reading achievement-level descriptions are summarized in figure 1.

Figure 1-A	The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
	Descriptions of NAEP reading achievement levels, grade 4
Basic Level (208)	Fourth-grade students performing at the <i>Basic</i> level should demonstrate an understanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for fourth graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text and their own experiences and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences.

For example, when reading **literary** text, they should be able to tell what the story is generally about—providing details to support their understanding—and be able to connect aspects of the stories to their own experiences.

When reading **informational** text, *Basic*-level fourth graders should be able to tell what the selection is generally about or identify the purpose for reading it, provide details to support their understanding, and connect ideas from the text to their background knowledge and experiences.

Proficient Level (238)	Fourth-grade students performing at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to demonstrate an overall understanding of the text, providing inferential as well as literal information. When reading text appropriate to fourth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas in the text by making inferences, drawing conclusions, and making connections to their own experiences. The connections between the text and what the student infers should be clear.
-------------------------------------	--

For example, when reading **literary** text, *Proficient*-level fourth graders should be able to summarize the story, draw conclusions about the characters or plot, and recognize relationships such as cause and effect.

When reading **informational** text, *Proficient*-level students should be able to summarize the information and identify the author's intent or purpose. They should be able to draw reasonable conclusions from the text, recognize relationships such as cause and effect or similarities and differences, and identify the meaning of the selection's key concepts.

Advanced Level (268)	Fourth-grade students performing at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to generalize about topics in the reading selection and demonstrate an awareness of how authors compose and use literary devices. When reading text appropriate to fourth grade, they should be able to judge texts critically and, in general, give thorough answers that indicate careful thought.
-----------------------------------	---

For example, when reading **literary** text, *Advanced*-level students should be able to make generalizations about the point of the story and extend its meaning by integrating personal experiences and other readings with ideas suggested by the text. They should be able to identify literary devices such as figurative language.

When reading **informational** text, *Advanced*-level fourth graders should be able to explain the author's intent by using supporting material from the text. They should be able to make critical judgments of the form and content of the text and explain their judgments clearly.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses indicate the cut point on the scale at which the achievement-level range begins.
SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2004). *Reading Framework for the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

Figure 1-B	The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment
	Descriptions of NAEP reading achievement levels, grade 8
Basic Level (243)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Basic</i> level should demonstrate a literal understanding of what they read and be able to make some interpretations. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to identify specific aspects of the text that reflect the overall meaning, extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences, recognize and relate interpretations and connections among ideas in the text to personal experience, and draw conclusions based on the text.

For example, when reading **literary** text, *Basic*-level eighth graders should be able to identify themes and make inferences and logical predictions about aspects such as plot and characters.

When reading **informational** text, they should be able to identify the main idea and the author's purpose. They should make inferences and draw conclusions supported by information in the text. They should recognize the relationships among the facts, ideas, events, and concepts of the text (e.g., cause and effect and chronological order).

When reading **practical** text, they should be able to identify the main purpose and make predictions about the relatively obvious outcomes of procedures in the text.

Proficient Level (281)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Proficient</i> level should be able to show an overall understanding of the text, including inferential as well as literal information. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to extend the ideas in the text by making clear inferences from it, by drawing conclusions, and by making connections to their own experiences—including other reading experiences. <i>Proficient</i> eighth graders should be able to identify some of the devices authors use in composing text.
-------------------------------------	--

For example, when reading **literary** text, students at the *Proficient* level should be able to give details and examples to support themes that they identify. They should be able to use implied as well as explicit information in articulating themes; to interpret the actions, behaviors, and motives of characters; and to identify the use of literary devices such as personification and foreshadowing.

When reading **informational** text, they should be able to summarize the text using explicit and implied information and support conclusions with inferences based on the text.

When reading **practical** text, *Proficient*-level students should be able to describe its purpose and support their views with examples and details. They should be able to judge the importance of certain steps and procedures.

Advanced Level (323)	Eighth-grade students performing at the <i>Advanced</i> level should be able to describe the more abstract themes and ideas of the overall text. When reading text appropriate to eighth grade, they should be able to analyze both meaning and form and support their analyses explicitly with examples from the text, and they should be able to extend text information by relating it to their experiences and to world events. At this level, student responses should be thorough, thoughtful, and extensive.
-----------------------------------	---

For example, when reading **literary** text, *Advanced*-level eighth graders should be able to make complex abstract summaries and theme statements. They should be able to describe the interactions of various literary elements (i.e., setting, plot, characters, and theme) and explain how the use of literary devices affects both the meaning of the text and their response to the author's style. They should be able critically to analyze and evaluate the composition of the text.

When reading **informational** text, they should be able to analyze the author's purpose and point of view. They should be able to use cultural and historical background information to develop perspectives on the text and be able to apply text information to broad issues and world situations.

When reading **practical** text, *Advanced*-level students should be able to synthesize information that will guide their performance, apply text information to new situations, and critique the usefulness of the form and content.

NOTE: The scores in parentheses indicate the cut point on the scale at which the achievement-level range begins.
SOURCE: National Assessment Governing Board. (2004). *Reading Framework for the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress*. Washington, DC: Author.

NAEP 2005 Reading Overall Scale Score and Achievement-Level Results for Public School Students

Overall Scale Score Results

In this section student performance is reported as an average score based on the NAEP reading scale, which ranges from 0 to 500. Scores on this scale are comparable from 1992 through 2005.

Prior to 1998, testing accommodations were not provided for students with special needs in NAEP state reading assessments. In 1998 only, results were reported for two samples of students: one in which accommodations were permitted and one in which accommodations were not permitted. Subsequent assessment results were based on the more inclusive samples. In the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Tables 1-A and 1-B present the overall performance results of grade 4 and 8 public school students in Utah the nation (public), and the region. The list of states making up a given region for NAEP prior to 2003 differed from the list used by the U.S. Census Bureau which has been used in NAEP from 2003 onward. Therefore, the data for the state's region are given only for 2003 and 2005. The first column of results presents the average score on the NAEP reading scale. The remaining columns show the scores at selected percentiles. A percentile indicates the percentage of students whose scores fell at or below a particular score. For example, the 25th percentile demarks the cut point for the lowest 25 percent of students within the distribution of scale scores.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results

- In 2005, the average scale score for students in Utah was 221. This was higher than that for students across the nation (217).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 1992 (220).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was higher than that in 1994 (217).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was higher than that in 1998 (216).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2002 (222).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2003 (219). However, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2005 was higher than that in 2003 (216).

**Table
1-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and selected percentiles, grade 4 public schools: various years, 1992–2005

Year and jurisdiction	Average scale score	10th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	90th Percentile
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	215(1.0)*	168(2.1)	192(0.9)*	217(1.7)	240(1.5)	259(2.4)
Utah	220(1.1)	180(2.3)	200(1.6)	223(1.4)	242(0.9)*	258(1.5)*
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	212(1.1)*	156(2.2)*	187(1.5)*	217(1.1)*	241(1.1)	261(1.4)
Utah	217(1.3)*	170(1.9)	196(1.3)	221(1.0)*	243(1.1)*	260(1.9)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	215(0.8)*	165(2.1)	192(1.0)*	218(0.8)	242(1.0)	261(1.3)
Utah	215(1.3)*	168(4.2)	194(2.4)	218(1.3)*	240(1.7)*	258(1.6)*
1998 Nation (public)	213(1.2)*	161(2.9)*	189(1.7)*	215(1.5)*	241(1.0)	260(0.9)
Utah	216(1.2)*	170(3.2)	195(1.8)	219(2.0)*	240(1.2)*	258(1.4)*
2002 Nation (public)	217(0.5)	169(0.8)	194(0.6)	219(0.4)	242(0.5)	261(0.5)
Utah	222(1.0)	178(2.0)	201(1.4)	224(1.0)	244(1.1)	261(1.2)
2003 Nation (public)	216(0.3)*	167(0.5)*	193(0.4)*	219(0.4)	243(0.2)	262(0.3)
West ²	210(0.7)	158(0.8)	185(1.2)	213(0.8)	238(0.7)	258(0.6)
Utah	219(1.0)	171(1.9)	198(1.9)	223(1.0)	244(0.9)	262(2.0)
2005 Nation (public)	217(0.2)	169(0.3)	194(0.3)	220(0.3)	243(0.2)	262(0.3)
West ²	211(0.5)	160(0.5)	186(0.6)	214(0.6)	238(0.5)	258(0.4)
Utah	221(1.0)	174(2.3)	200(2.4)	225(1.0)	246(1.1)	264(1.4)

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2005 Reading Assessments.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results

- In 2005, the average scale score for students in Utah was 262. This was not significantly different from that for students across the nation (260).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 1998 (263).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2002 (263).
- In Utah, the average scale score for students in 2005 was lower than that in 2003 (264). Similarly, the average scale score for students in public schools across the nation in 2005 was lower than that in 2003 (261).

**Table
1-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and selected percentiles, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Year and jurisdiction	Average scale score	10th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	90th Percentile
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	261(0.8)	215(1.5)	240(1.3)	264(1.3)	286(0.8)	304(1.3)
Utah	265(1.1)*	223(2.7)	246(2.8)	267(1.5)	286(1.2)	301(0.9)
1998 Nation (public)	261(0.8)	214(2.0)	238(1.0)	264(1.0)	285(1.2)	303(1.0)
Utah	263(1.0)	220(2.9)	246(1.3)*	268(1.3)	286(1.0)	301(1.9)
2002 Nation (public)	263(0.5)*	219(0.9)*	242(0.5)*	265(0.6)*	286(0.5)*	303(0.3)
Utah	263(1.1)	218(2.5)	243(1.7)	266(1.3)	287(1.2)	304(2.2)
2003 Nation (public)	261(0.2)*	215(0.5)	240(0.3)*	264(0.3)*	286(0.3)*	304(0.3)
West ²	256(0.7)	206(1.8)	233(1.2)	259(0.8)	282(1.1)	301(0.8)
Utah	264(0.8)*	221(2.0)	245(1.1)*	268(1.2)	287(1.2)	303(1.0)
2005 Nation (public)	260(0.2)	214(0.3)	238(0.3)	263(0.2)	285(0.2)	303(0.2)
West ²	255(0.4)	207(0.7)	232(0.4)	257(0.5)	280(0.5)	299(0.6)
Utah	262(0.8)	217(1.5)	241(1.2)	265(1.4)	285(1.2)	302(1.0)

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Overall Achievement-Level Results

In this section student performance is reported as the percentage of students performing relative to performance standards set by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). These performance standards for what students should know and be able to do were based on the recommendations of broadly representative panels of educators and members of the public.

In 1998 only, results were obtained for two student samples: one for which accommodations were permitted and one for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample in which accommodations were permitted.

Tables 2-A and 2-B present the percentage of students at grade 4 and 8 who performed below *Basic*, at or above *Basic*, at or above *Proficient*, and at the *Advanced* level. Because the percentages are cumulative from *Basic* to *Proficient* to *Advanced*, they sum to more than 100 percent. Only the percentage of students performing at or above *Basic* (which includes the students at *Proficient* and *Advanced*) plus the students below *Basic* will sum to 100 percent (except for rounding).

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2005, the percentage of Utah's students who performed at or above *Proficient* was 34 percent. This was greater than the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (30 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was greater than that in 1992 (30 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 1994 (30 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was greater than that in 1998 (28 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2002 (33 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2003 (32 percent).

**Table
2-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Percentage of students at or above reading achievement levels, grade 4 public schools: various years, 1992–2005

Year and jurisdiction	Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	40(1.1)*	60(1.1)*	27(1.3)*	6(0.6)
Utah	33(1.6)	67(1.6)	30(1.6)*	5(0.6)*
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	41(1.1)*	59(1.1)*	28(1.2)	7(0.7)
Utah	36(1.6)	64(1.6)	30(1.6)	6(0.8)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	39(1.0)	61(1.0)	29(0.9)	6(0.5)
Utah	38(1.7)*	62(1.7)*	28(1.6)*	5(0.8)*
1998 Nation (public)	42(1.3)*	58(1.3)*	28(1.0)*	6(0.5)
Utah	38(1.7)*	62(1.7)*	28(1.4)*	5(0.5)*
2002 Nation (public)	38(0.5)	62(0.5)	30(0.5)	6(0.2)
Utah	31(1.2)	69(1.2)	33(1.5)	6(0.6)
2003 Nation (public)	38(0.3)*	62(0.3)*	30(0.3)	7(0.1)
West ²	45(0.9)	55(0.9)	25(0.7)	6(0.3)
Utah	34(1.3)	66(1.3)	32(1.2)	7(0.7)
2005 Nation (public)	38(0.3)	62(0.3)	30(0.2)	7(0.1)
West ²	44(0.6)	56(0.6)	25(0.4)	6(0.2)
Utah	32(1.3)	68(1.3)	34(1.3)	8(0.8)

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 207 or lower; *Basic*, 208–237; *Proficient*, 238–267; and *Advanced*, 268 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2005 Reading Assessments.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results

- In 2005, the percentage of Utah's students who performed at or above *Proficient* was 29 percent. This was not significantly different from the percentage of the nation's public school students who performed at or above *Proficient* (29 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 1998 (31 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2002 (32 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students who performed at or above *Proficient* in 2005 was not significantly different from that in 2003 (32 percent).

**Table
2-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Percentage of students at or above reading achievement levels, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Year and jurisdiction	Below <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Basic</i>	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	At <i>Advanced</i>
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	28(0.9)	72(0.9)	31(0.9)	2(0.4)
Utah	23(1.5)*	77(1.5)*	31(1.2)	2(0.3)
1998 Nation (public)	29(0.8)	71(0.8)	30(1.1)	2(0.3)
Utah	23(1.2)*	77(1.2)*	31(1.6)	1(0.3)
2002 Nation (public)	26(0.5)*	74(0.5)*	31(0.6)*	2(0.2)
Utah	25(1.2)	75(1.2)	32(1.3)	2(0.3)
2003 Nation (public)	28(0.3)*	72(0.3)*	30(0.3)*	3(0.1)
West ²	34(0.7)	66(0.7)	26(0.8)	2(0.2)
Utah	24(1.0)*	76(1.0)*	32(1.4)	2(0.4)
2005 Nation (public)	29(0.2)	71(0.2)	29(0.2)	3(0.1)
West ²	35(0.5)	65(0.5)	24(0.4)	2(0.1)
Utah	27(0.9)	73(0.9)	29(1.2)	2(0.4)

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² The four regions defined by the U.S. Census Bureau are Northeast, South, Midwest, and West.

NOTE: Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 242 or lower; *Basic*, 243–280; *Proficient*, 281–322; and *Advanced*, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Race/Ethnicity

Schools report the racial/ethnic subgroup that best described the students eligible to be assessed. The six mutually exclusive categories are White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Unclassified. Black includes African American, Hispanic includes Latino, and Pacific Islander includes Native Hawaiian. Race categories exclude Hispanic origin unless specified. Tables 3-A and 3-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Utah and the nation by race/ethnicity. In 1998 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and those for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2005, White students in Utah had an average scale score that was higher than that of Hispanic students, but was not found to be significantly different from that of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- The average scale score of White students in Utah was higher in 2005 than in 1992. The average scale score of Hispanic students in Utah was not significantly different between 1992 and 2005.
- The average scale score of White students in Utah was higher in 2005 than in 1994. The average scale scores of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 1994 and 2005.
- The average scale score of White students in Utah was higher in 2005 than in 1998. The average scale scores of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 1998 and 2005.
- The average scale scores of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 2002 and 2005.
- The average scale scores of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 2003 and 2005.
- The sample size was not sufficient to permit a reliable estimate for Black students in Utah in 2005. Therefore, the performance gap data are not reported.
- In 2005, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 27 points. In 1992, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 21 points.

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In Utah in 2005, the percentage of White students performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than that of Hispanic students, but was not found to be significantly different from that of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- The percentage of White students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* was greater in 2005 than in 1992. The differences between the percentages of Hispanic students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 1992 and the percentage in 2005 was not found to be significant.
- The percentage of White students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* was greater in 2005 than in 1994. The differences between the percentages of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 1994 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.
- The percentage of White students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* was greater in 2005 than in 1998. The differences between the percentages of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 1998 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.
- The differences between the percentages of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 2002 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.
- The differences between the percentages of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 2003 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.

**Table
3-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 4 public schools: various years, 1992–2005

Race/ethnicity	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
White						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	72(0.9)*	223(1.4)*	31(1.5)*	69(1.5)*	33(1.8)*	8(0.9)
Utah	93(0.9)*	222(1.0)*	31(1.5)	69(1.5)	31(1.6)*	5(0.7)*
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	71(0.8)*	222(1.3)*	31(1.3)*	69(1.3)*	35(1.5)*	9(0.9)
Utah	91(0.9)*	219(1.2)*	34(1.7)*	66(1.7)*	31(1.6)*	6(0.8)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	69(0.8)*	224(1.0)*	30(1.3)*	70(1.3)*	36(1.2)*	8(0.7)
Utah	86(1.2)*	220(1.2)*	33(1.6)*	67(1.6)*	30(1.6)*	5(0.9)*
1998 Nation (public)	64(1.9)*	223(1.1)*	31(1.3)*	69(1.3)*	36(1.2)*	9(0.7)
Utah	86(1.1)*	220(1.1)*	34(1.6)*	66(1.6)*	30(1.5)*	6(0.5)*
2002 Nation (public)	60(0.7)*	227(0.3)	26(0.4)	74(0.4)	39(0.5)	9(0.3)
Utah	86(0.8)*	224(1.0)	28(1.3)	72(1.3)	35(1.6)	7(0.6)
2003 Nation (public)	59(0.4)*	227(0.2)	26(0.3)	74(0.3)	39(0.3)	10(0.2)
Utah	83(1.2)	223(1.0)	29(1.3)	71(1.3)	35(1.3)	8(0.9)
2005 Nation (public)	57(0.3)	228(0.2)	25(0.2)	75(0.2)	39(0.3)	10(0.2)
Utah	82(1.0)	226(1.0)	27(1.2)	73(1.2)	38(1.4)	9(1.0)
Black						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	18(0.5)	191(1.7)*	69(2.1)*	31(2.1)*	8(1.4)*	1(0.4)
Utah	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	18(0.8)	184(1.8)*	72(2.7)*	28(2.7)*	8(0.9)*	1(0.3)
Utah	1(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	17(0.5)	192(1.7)*	66(1.8)*	34(1.8)*	9(0.9)*	1(0.5)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	16(1.3)	192(2.1)*	66(1.9)*	34(1.9)*	10(1.0)*	1(0.5)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	18(0.4)	198(0.6)	61(0.7)	39(0.7)	12(0.5)	1(0.2)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	17(0.3)	197(0.4)*	61(0.5)	39(0.5)	12(0.4)	2(0.1)
Utah	2(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	17(0.3)	199(0.3)	59(0.6)	41(0.6)	12(0.3)	2(0.1)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Hispanic						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	7(0.7)*	194(2.7)*	63(2.7)*	37(2.7)*	10(1.7)*	1(***)
Utah	3(0.5)*	200(4.7)	59(7.9)	41(7.9)	13(3.9)	2(***)
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	7(0.6)*	186(3.6)*	68(3.7)*	32(3.7)*	11(2.1)	2(0.8)
Utah	4(0.5)*	192(4.4)	61(4.8)	39(4.8)	14(3.2)	3(***)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	10(0.7)*	194(2.1)*	62(2.5)*	38(2.5)*	12(1.6)	2(0.6)
Utah	7(0.6)*	186(3.8)*	70(4.9)	30(4.9)	7(3.0)	1(***)
1998 Nation (public)	14(1.4)*	192(3.2)*	64(3.3)*	36(3.3)*	12(1.7)	2(0.5)
Utah	8(0.7)*	190(3.0)	67(5.6)	33(5.6)	7(2.4)	#(***)
2002 Nation (public)	17(0.5)*	199(1.4)	57(1.4)	43(1.4)	14(0.8)	2(0.3)
Utah	9(0.5)*	201(2.8)	56(4.2)	44(4.2)	14(3.0)	1(***)
2003 Nation (public)	18(0.4)*	199(0.6)	57(0.8)	43(0.8)	14(0.5)	2(0.2)
Utah	11(0.9)	194(2.7)	64(4.1)	36(4.1)	11(1.8)	1(0.7)
2005 Nation (public)	19(0.2)	201(0.5)	56(0.7)	44(0.7)	15(0.5)	2(0.2)
Utah	12(0.9)	199(2.4)	59(3.2)	41(3.2)	14(2.4)	2(0.9)

See notes at end of table.

**Table
3-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 4 public schools: various years, 1992–2005—Continued

Race/ethnicity	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Asian/Pacific Islander						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	2(0.4)*	215(3.2)*	41(5.4)*	59(5.4)*	23(4.9)*	4(2.5)
Utah	2(0.4)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	3(0.5)*	217(4.2)*	36(4.8)	64(4.8)	34(4.6)	9(4.4)
Utah	3(0.4)	212(4.9)	42(7.1)	58(7.1)	25(7.1)	8(3.7)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	2(0.4)*	218(4.5)	39(5.7)	61(5.7)	31(5.7)	10(3.6)
Utah	3(0.5)	208(4.5)	47(7.3)	53(7.3)	21(5.2)	3(***)
1998 Nation (public)	4(0.9)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	3(0.5)	216(6.1)	36(7.4)	64(7.4)	28(7.2)	3(***)
2002 Nation (public)	4(0.2)	223(1.7)	31(2.2)	69(2.2)	36(2.1)	9(0.8)
Utah	3(0.4)	214(4.0)	41(5.4)	59(5.4)	24(6.0)	3(***)
2003 Nation (public)	4(0.2)	225(1.3)	31(1.7)	69(1.7)	37(1.5)	11(1.1)
Utah	3(0.4)	212(5.1)	46(6.6)	54(6.6)	23(5.7)	4(2.3)
2005 Nation (public)	4(0.1)	227(0.8)	28(1.0)	72(1.0)	40(1.1)	12(0.8)
Utah	3(0.4)	218(4.2)	38(7.0)	62(7.0)	30(6.3)	8(3.2)
American Indian/Alaska Native						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	1(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	1(0.4)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	1(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	1(0.4)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	1(0.2)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	2(0.8)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	1(0.5)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	207(2.0)	49(2.8)	51(2.8)	22(2.3)	5(1.0)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	202(1.4)	53(2.0)	47(2.0)	16(1.4)	2(0.6)
Utah	1(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	205(1.3)	51(1.6)	49(1.6)	19(1.1)	3(0.6)
Utah	1(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Unclassified²						
1992 ¹ Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1994 ¹ Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	216(3.7)	41(6.2)	59(6.2)	26(4.7)	6(1.2)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	1(0.0)*	220(1.6)	34(2.3)	66(2.3)	31(2.6)	7(1.4)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	1(0.0)	221(1.4)	33(2.2)	67(2.2)	32(2.4)	8(1.4)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)

Estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards are not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² "Unclassified" students are those whose school-reported race was "other" or "unavailable," or was missing, and who self-reported more than one race category or none.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 207 or lower; *Basic*, 208–237; *Proficient*, 238–267; and *Advanced*, 268 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1992–2005 Reading Assessments.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In 2005, White students in Utah had an average scale score that was higher than that of Hispanic students, but was not found to be significantly different from that of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- The average scale scores of White and Hispanic students in Utah were not significantly different between 1998 and 2005.
- The average scale scores of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 2002 and 2005.
- The average scale score of White students in Utah was lower in 2005 than in 2003. The average scale scores of Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah were not significantly different between 2003 and 2005.
- The sample size was not sufficient to permit a reliable estimate for Black students in Utah in 2005. Therefore, the performance gap data are not reported.
- In 2005, Hispanic students had an average score that was lower than that of White students by 22 points. In 1998, the average score for Hispanic students was lower than that of White students by 21 points.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Race/Ethnicity

- In Utah in 2005, the percentage of White students performing at or above *Proficient* was greater than that of Hispanic students, but was not found to be significantly different from that of Asian/Pacific Islander students.
- The differences between the percentages of White and Hispanic students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 1998 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.
- The differences between the percentages of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 2002 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.
- The differences between the percentages of White, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students in Utah performing at or above *Proficient* in 2003 and the respective percentages in 2005 were not found to be significant.

**Table
3-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Race/ethnicity	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
White						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	68(0.6)*	269(0.9)	20(0.9)	80(0.9)	38(1.2)	3(0.5)
Utah	90(0.7)*	266(1.0)	21(1.5)	79(1.5)	32(1.2)	2(0.3)
1998 Nation (public)	68(0.7)*	268(1.0)	21(1.0)	79(1.0)	37(1.3)	3(0.4)
Utah	90(0.8)*	266(0.9)	20(1.2)	80(1.2)	32(1.5)	1(0.3)*
2002 Nation (public)	64(0.6)*	271(0.5)*	17(0.5)*	83(0.5)*	39(0.7)	3(0.3)
Utah	86(1.0)	267(1.0)	21(1.2)	79(1.2)	35(1.3)	2(0.3)
2003 Nation (public)	61(0.4)*	270(0.2)*	18(0.3)*	82(0.3)*	39(0.3)*	4(0.1)
Utah	86(1.0)	268(0.8)*	20(1.0)*	80(1.0)*	35(1.5)	2(0.4)
2005 Nation (public)	60(0.3)	269(0.2)	19(0.2)	81(0.2)	37(0.3)	3(0.1)
Utah	84(1.0)	265(0.9)	24(1.0)	76(1.0)	32(1.3)	2(0.4)
Black						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	15(0.4)*	241(1.7)	51(2.5)	49(2.5)	11(1.3)	#(***)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	16(0.4)*	242(1.2)	50(1.8)	50(1.8)	11(1.6)	#(***)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	15(0.4)*	244(0.8)*	46(1.0)	54(1.0)	13(0.7)	#(0.2)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	17(0.3)	244(0.5)	47(0.6)	53(0.6)	12(0.4)	#(0.1)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	17(0.3)	242(0.4)	49(0.6)	51(0.6)	11(0.4)	#(0.1)
Utah	1(0.2)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Hispanic						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	12(0.5)*	243(2.6)	47(3.3)	53(3.3)	14(1.5)	#(0.2)
Utah	5(0.5)*	252(5.3)	41(6.3)	59(6.3)	23(6.4)	2(***)
1998 Nation (public)	12(0.5)*	241(1.7)	48(2.5)	52(2.5)	13(1.0)	#(0.3)
Utah	5(0.6)*	244(4.6)	44(6.7)	56(6.7)	20(4.3)	1(***)
2002 Nation (public)	15(0.4)*	245(0.8)	44(1.3)	56(1.3)	14(0.8)	#(0.2)
Utah	8(0.6)	238(2.9)	55(3.6)	45(3.6)	9(2.9)	#(***)
2003 Nation (public)	15(0.3)*	244(0.7)	46(1.0)	54(1.0)	14(0.6)	1(0.2)
Utah	9(0.7)	241(2.9)	49(3.1)	51(3.1)	13(4.2)	#(***)
2005 Nation (public)	17(0.2)	245(0.4)	45(0.7)	55(0.7)	14(0.4)	1(0.1)
Utah	10(0.8)	243(2.5)	48(3.3)	52(3.3)	12(2.8)	#(***)
Asian/Pacific Islander						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	3(0.5)	265(5.2)	25(7.7)	75(7.7)	32(6.0)	3(1.1)
Utah	3(0.4)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	4(0.6)	261(7.6)	27(9.6)	73(9.6)	30(6.1)	3(1.5)
Utah	2(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	4(0.2)	265(1.7)*	25(2.2)	75(2.2)	34(2.0)	3(0.8)
Utah	3(0.4)	254(4.0)	35(5.6)	65(5.6)	22(5.3)	2(***)
2003 Nation (public)	4(0.2)	268(1.2)	22(1.3)	78(1.3)	38(1.7)	5(0.6)
Utah	2(0.3)	262(4.2)	26(5.6)	74(5.6)	28(6.4)	2(***)
2005 Nation (public)	4(0.1)	270(0.8)	21(0.8)	79(0.8)	39(1.3)	5(0.6)
Utah	3(0.4)	266(3.1)	23(5.5)	77(5.5)	31(5.0)	4(2.5)

See notes at end of table.

**Table
3-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by race/ethnicity, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005—Continued

Race/ethnicity	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
American Indian/Alaska Native						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	#(0.2)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	2(0.5)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	#(0.2)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	2(0.7)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	252(2.5)	36(4.1)	64(4.1)	18(2.2)	1(**)
Utah	2(0.8)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	248(1.7)	41(2.5)	59(2.5)	18(1.6)	1(0.3)
Utah	2(0.3)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	1(0.0)	251(1.2)	39(1.7)	61(1.7)	18(1.5)	1(0.4)
Utah	2(0.8)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Unclassified²						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	#(0.1)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	1(0.1)	260(2.8)	28(6.4)	72(6.4)	24(4.1)	2(1.0)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	1(0.0)*	261(1.8)	27(2.5)	73(2.5)	28(3.5)	2(0.7)
Utah	#(***)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	1(0.0)	261(1.7)	30(2.4)	70(2.4)	30(2.2)	3(0.8)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)

Estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards are not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

² "Unclassified" students are those whose school-reported race was "other" or "unavailable," or was missing, and who self-reported more than one race category or none.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 242 or lower; *Basic*, 243–280; *Proficient*, 281–322; and *Advanced*, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Student Eligibility for Free/Reduced-Price School Lunch

NAEP collects data on eligibility for the federal program providing free or reduced-price school lunches. The free/reduced-price lunch component of the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) offered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is designed to ensure that children near or below the poverty line receive nourishing meals. Eligibility is determined through the USDA's Income Eligibility Guidelines, and results for this category of students are included as an indicator of lower family income. NAEP first collected information on participation in this program in 1996; therefore, cross-year comparisons to assessments prior to 1996 cannot be made.

Tables 4-A and 4-B show average scale scores and achievement-level data for public school students at grades 4 and 8 in Utah and the nation by eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch. In 1998 only, results were obtained for student samples for which accommodations were permitted and those for which accommodations were not permitted. However, in the text of this report, comparisons to 1998 results refer only to the sample for which accommodations were permitted.

Grade 4 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In 2005, students in Utah eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 208. This was lower than that of students in Utah not eligible for this program (229).
- In 2005, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 21 points. In 1998, the average score for students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch was lower than the score of those not eligible by 17 points.
- Students in Utah eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (208) in 2005 that was higher than that of students in the nation who were eligible (203).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (208) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 1998 (205).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (208) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 2002 (211).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (208) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 2003 (206).

Grade 4 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In Utah in 2005, 20 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 41 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above *Proficient*. These percentages were found to be significantly different from one another.
- For students in Utah in 2005 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above *Proficient* (20 percent) was greater than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (15 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (20 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (18 percent) for 1998.
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (20 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (22 percent) for 2002.
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (20 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (20 percent) for 2003.

**Table
4-A**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch, grade 4 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Eligibility status	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Eligible						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	38(1.3)*	198(1.2)*	58(1.5)*	42(1.5)*	13(1.2)*	1(0.4)
Utah	32(2.3)	203(2.2)	51(2.6)	49(2.6)	17(2.3)	2(0.9)
1998 Nation (public)	41(1.8)	195(1.7)*	61(1.9)*	39(1.9)*	12(1.0)*	1(0.3)*
Utah	32(2.4)	205(2.1)	50(2.7)	50(2.7)	18(1.5)	3(0.6)
2002 Nation (public)	43(0.9)*	202(0.7)	54(0.8)	46(0.8)	16(0.5)	2(0.2)
Utah	32(1.8)	211(1.7)	44(2.3)	56(2.3)	22(1.7)	3(0.8)
2003 Nation (public)	44(0.4)*	201(0.4)*	56(0.4)*	44(0.4)*	15(0.3)	2(0.1)
Utah	33(1.7)	206(1.5)	49(2.1)	51(2.1)	20(1.6)	3(0.7)
2005 Nation (public)	45(0.3)	203(0.3)	54(0.5)	46(0.5)	15(0.2)	2(0.1)
Utah	36(1.4)	208(1.6)	47(2.3)	53(2.3)	20(1.7)	3(0.8)
Not eligible						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	54(1.9)	226(1.0)*	28(1.3)*	72(1.3)*	39(1.3)*	10(0.9)
Utah	51(3.0)*	222(1.5)*	31(1.8)*	69(1.8)*	32(1.8)*	6(1.1)*
1998 Nation (public)	51(1.9)	226(0.9)*	28(1.0)*	72(1.0)*	39(1.2)*	10(0.8)
Utah	51(2.9)*	222(1.3)*	31(2.3)*	69(2.3)*	32(2.0)*	6(0.7)*
2002 Nation (public)	50(0.9)*	229(0.4)	24(0.5)	76(0.5)	41(0.7)	10(0.3)
Utah	63(2.0)	228(1.1)	25(1.3)	75(1.3)	39(2.0)	8(0.8)
2003 Nation (public)	52(0.5)	229(0.3)	25(0.3)*	75(0.3)*	41(0.5)	11(0.2)
Utah	66(1.7)	226(1.1)	26(1.2)	74(1.2)	38(1.3)	8(1.1)
2005 Nation (public)	53(0.4)	230(0.2)	23(0.3)	77(0.3)	42(0.3)	11(0.2)
Utah	61(1.9)	229(1.0)	24(1.3)	76(1.3)	41(1.7)	10(1.1)
Information not available						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	7(1.9)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	17(3.7)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
1998 Nation (public)	7(1.7)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
Utah	17(3.7)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2002 Nation (public)	7(0.7)*	217(2.4)	38(2.8)	62(2.8)	30(2.3)	7(1.0)
Utah	5(1.7)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2003 Nation (public)	4(0.3)*	219(1.7)	35(1.8)	65(1.8)	33(1.9)	8(0.7)
Utah	1(0.5)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	2(0.2)	218(2.5)	38(2.7)	62(2.7)	32(2.6)	8(1.1)
Utah	4(1.7)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)

‡ Reporting standards are not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 207 or lower; *Basic*, 208–237; *Proficient*, 238–267; and *Advanced*, 268 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In 2005, students in Utah eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 254. This was lower than that of students in Utah not eligible for this program (266).
- In 2005, students who were eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch had an average score that was lower than that of students who were not eligible for free/reduced-price school lunch by 12 points. This performance gap was narrower than that of 1998 (20 points).
- Students in Utah eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (254) in 2005 that was higher than that of students in the nation who were eligible (247).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (254) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 1998 (248).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (254) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 2002 (249).
- In Utah, students eligible for free/reduced-priced lunch had an average reading scale score in 2005 (254) that was not significantly different from that of eligible students in 2003 (251).

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligibility

- In Utah in 2005, 22 percent of students who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch and 33 percent of those who were not eligible for this program performed at or above *Proficient*. These percentages were found to be significantly different from one another.
- For students in Utah in 2005 who were eligible for free/reduced-price lunch, the percentage at or above *Proficient* (22 percent) was greater than the corresponding percentage for their counterparts around the nation (15 percent).
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (22 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (19 percent) for 1998.
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (22 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (21 percent) for 2002.
- In Utah, the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch who performed at or above *Proficient* for 2005 (22 percent) was not significantly different from the corresponding percentage (19 percent) for 2003.

**Table
4-B**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by eligibility for free/reduced-price school lunch, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Eligibility status	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Eligible						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	30(0.8)*	246(1.3)	44(1.6)	56(1.6)	15(1.0)	#(***)
Utah	21(1.2)*	254(2.4)	34(3.7)	66(3.7)	21(3.0)	1(0.5)
1998 Nation (public)	30(0.9)*	245(1.0)	45(1.3)	55(1.3)	14(1.0)	#(0.1)
Utah	21(1.3)*	248(2.7)	38(3.1)	62(3.1)	19(2.4)	1(***)
2002 Nation (public)	34(0.7)*	249(0.5)*	40(0.7)*	60(0.7)*	17(0.5)*	1(0.1)
Utah	25(1.5)*	249(2.8)	41(2.7)	59(2.7)	21(2.2)	1(0.7)
2003 Nation (public)	36(0.4)*	246(0.4)	44(0.5)	56(0.5)	15(0.3)	1(0.1)
Utah	26(1.1)*	251(1.4)	38(2.6)	62(2.6)	19(2.3)	#(***)
2005 Nation (public)	39(0.3)	247(0.3)	43(0.4)	57(0.4)	15(0.3)	1(0.1)
Utah	33(1.1)	254(1.2)	36(1.9)	64(1.9)	22(1.9)	1(0.6)
Not eligible						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	58(1.8)	269(1.0)	20(1.0)	80(1.0)	38(1.4)	3(0.6)
Utah	68(1.1)	269(1.2)	18(1.5)*	82(1.5)*	35(1.4)	2(0.4)
1998 Nation (public)	58(1.8)	268(1.0)	21(1.0)	79(1.0)	37(1.5)	3(0.5)
Utah	69(1.3)	268(0.9)	19(1.3)*	81(1.3)*	35(1.9)	2(0.3)
2002 Nation (public)	57(1.1)	271(0.5)*	17(0.5)*	83(0.5)*	40(0.6)*	3(0.3)
Utah	65(1.3)	269(0.9)*	18(1.1)*	82(1.1)*	36(1.4)	2(0.4)
2003 Nation (public)	58(0.5)	271(0.3)*	18(0.3)*	82(0.3)*	39(0.4)*	4(0.1)
Utah	70(1.4)	269(1.0)*	18(1.1)*	82(1.1)*	37(1.6)	3(0.5)
2005 Nation (public)	59(0.3)	270(0.2)	19(0.2)	81(0.2)	38(0.2)	4(0.2)
Utah	67(1.1)	266(1.0)	22(0.9)	78(0.9)	33(1.5)	3(0.5)
Information not available						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	12(1.9)*	265(2.7)	25(3.1)	75(3.1)	35(2.9)	4(0.9)
Utah	11(0.8)*	261(2.9)	28(4.3)	72(4.3)	26(3.6)	2(***)
1998 Nation (public)	11(1.9)*	264(2.3)	27(2.1)	73(2.1)	34(2.8)	3(1.2)
Utah	9(0.6)*	267(1.9)	19(3.0)	81(3.0)	31(3.4)	2(***)
2002 Nation (public)	10(1.0)*	264(2.5)	25(2.0)*	75(2.0)*	32(2.7)	4(1.9)
Utah	10(1.8)*	261(5.2)	31(8.1)	69(8.1)	31(6.2)	3(1.6)
2003 Nation (public)	6(0.4)*	262(1.0)	28(1.1)	72(1.1)	31(1.1)	3(0.5)
Utah	4(1.0)*	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)
2005 Nation (public)	3(0.3)	258(1.8)	31(1.9)	69(1.9)	28(1.9)	3(0.6)
Utah	#(0.1)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)	‡(‡)

Estimate rounds to zero.

‡ Reporting standards are not met.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 242 or lower; *Basic*, 243–280; *Proficient*, 281–322; and *Advanced*, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Parents' Highest Level of Education

Eighth-grade students who participated in the NAEP 2005 assessment were asked to indicate the highest level of education they thought their father and their mother had completed. Five response options—did not finish high school, graduated from high school, some education after high school, graduated from college, and "I don't know"—were offered. The highest level of education reported for either parent was used in the analysis of this question. Fourth-graders' replies to this question are not provided in NAEP reports because their responses in previous NAEP assessments were highly variable, and a large percentage of them chose the "I don't know" option.

Grade 8 Scale Score Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2005, students in Utah who reported that a parent had graduated from college had an average scale score that was higher than the average scores of students with a parent in any of the following education categories: did not finish high school, graduated from high school, and some education after high school.
- The differences between the average scale scores in 2005 and 1998 for students in Utah who reported that a parent had graduated from college, or had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school were not significant.
- The differences between the average scale scores in 2005 and 2003 for students in Utah who reported that a parent had graduated from college, or had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school were not significant.

Grade 8 Achievement-Level Results by Parents' Highest Level of Education

- In 2005, the percentage of students performing at or above *Proficient* in Utah who reported that a parent had graduated from college was higher than the percentage for students whose parents' highest level of education was in any of the following categories: did not finish high school, graduated from high school, and some education after high school.
- In 2005, the percentage of students performing at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the percentage in 1998 for students reporting that a parent had graduated from college, or had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school.
- In 2005, the percentage of students performing at or above *Proficient* was not found to be significantly different from the percentage in 2003 for students reporting that a parent had graduated from college, or had some education after high school, or had graduated from high school, or had not finished high school.

**Table
5**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by parents' highest level of education, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005

Highest level of education	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
not finished high school						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	8(0.4)	242(1.9)	49(2.5)	51(2.5)	11(1.5)	#(***)
Utah	3(0.4)*	247(5.1)	38(8.9)	62(8.9)	13(3.9)	#(***)
1998 Nation (public)	8(0.4)	242(1.6)	49(2.6)	51(2.6)	11(1.3)	#(***)
Utah	3(0.4)*	247(4.8)	42(6.3)	58(6.3)	14(4.3)	#(***)
2002 Nation (public)	7(0.2)*	247(1.0)*	42(1.8)*	58(1.8)*	14(1.1)	#(0.3)
Utah	4(0.4)	235(3.8)	59(6.2)	41(6.2)	10(3.8)	#(***)
2003 Nation (public)	7(0.1)	245(0.6)	45(1.1)	55(1.1)	13(0.6)	#(0.1)
Utah	3(0.5)	238(3.9)	52(6.7)	48(6.7)	7(2.9)	#(***)
2005 Nation (public)	8(0.1)	244(0.5)	47(0.8)	53(0.8)	12(0.5)	#(0.1)
Utah	5(0.5)	240(3.5)	54(5.1)	46(5.1)	10(3.5)	1(***)
graduated from high school						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	23(0.6)*	253(1.3)	36(2.1)	64(2.1)	21(1.3)	1(0.4)
Utah	16(1.0)	251(2.3)	37(3.4)	63(3.4)	14(2.8)	1(***)
1998 Nation (public)	23(0.6)*	253(1.4)	36(2.0)	64(2.0)	20(2.1)	1(0.3)
Utah	16(1.0)	248(2.5)	40(3.1)	60(3.1)	14(1.9)	#(***)
2002 Nation (public)	18(0.2)	256(0.5)*	31(0.8)*	69(0.8)*	21(0.7)*	1(0.2)
Utah	14(0.8)	251(1.9)	37(3.3)	63(3.3)	16(1.9)	1(***)
2003 Nation (public)	18(0.2)	253(0.4)*	35(0.4)*	65(0.4)*	19(0.5)	1(0.1)
Utah	13(0.7)	249(2.1)	40(3.2)	60(3.2)	17(2.4)	1(0.4)
2005 Nation (public)	18(0.2)	252(0.3)	37(0.5)	63(0.5)	18(0.4)	1(0.1)
Utah	13(0.8)	248(2.3)	42(3.9)	58(3.9)	13(2.8)	#(***)
some education after high school						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	18(0.5)	268(1.4)	20(1.6)	80(1.6)	35(2.1)	2(0.7)
Utah	18(1.0)	265(2.0)	20(2.5)	80(2.5)	31(3.4)	2(0.9)
1998 Nation (public)	18(0.5)	267(1.1)	22(1.6)	78(1.6)	34(2.1)	2(0.5)
Utah	18(1.0)	267(1.8)	19(2.4)	81(2.4)	33(3.4)	1(0.6)
2002 Nation (public)	20(0.3)*	267(0.6)*	19(0.8)*	81(0.8)*	33(0.8)	2(0.3)
Utah	19(0.8)	263(2.1)	23(2.2)	77(2.2)	29(2.8)	1(0.7)
2003 Nation (public)	18(0.2)	266(0.4)*	21(0.6)	79(0.6)	32(0.5)	2(0.1)
Utah	18(0.8)	262(1.7)	24(2.7)	76(2.7)	28(2.4)	1(0.7)
2005 Nation (public)	18(0.1)	265(0.2)	23(0.5)	77(0.5)	31(0.4)	2(0.1)
Utah	19(0.8)	262(1.7)	24(2.9)	76(2.9)	27(2.7)	1(0.6)
graduated from college						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	42(0.9)*	272(1.0)	18(1.0)	82(1.0)	42(1.5)	4(0.7)
Utah	55(1.5)	273(0.9)	14(1.1)	86(1.1)	40(1.5)	2(0.4)
1998 Nation (public)	42(0.8)*	271(1.0)	19(1.1)	81(1.1)	41(1.6)	4(0.5)
Utah	55(1.5)	273(1.1)	13(1.0)*	87(1.0)*	40(2.0)	2(0.4)
2002 Nation (public)	46(0.6)	273(0.5)*	17(0.5)*	83(0.5)*	42(0.8)*	4(0.4)
Utah	55(1.0)	273(1.0)	15(1.3)	85(1.3)	43(1.8)	4(0.4)
2003 Nation (public)	46(0.3)	271(0.3)	19(0.3)	81(0.3)	41(0.4)	4(0.2)
Utah	56(1.2)	273(1.0)	15(0.9)	85(0.9)	42(1.8)	3(0.5)
2005 Nation (public)	46(0.2)	270(0.2)	20(0.3)	80(0.3)	40(0.3)	4(0.2)
Utah	54(1.0)	270(1.1)	18(1.3)	82(1.3)	39(1.7)	3(0.7)

See notes at end of table.

**Table
5**

The Nation's Report Card 2005 State Assessment

Average reading scale scores and percentage of students at or above each achievement level, by parents' highest level of education, grade 8 public schools: various years, 1998–2005—Continued

Highest level of education	Percent of students	Average scale score	Below Basic	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At Advanced
Unknown						
1998 ¹ Nation (public)	10(0.4)*	241(2.0)	51(2.3)	49(2.3)	12(1.2)	#(***)
Utah	7(0.6)	243(3.4)	50(6.9)	50(6.9)	11(4.5)	#(***)
1998 Nation (public)	9(0.4)*	241(1.4)	49(2.0)	51(2.0)	12(1.5)	#(***)
Utah	8(0.6)	232(3.2)*	55(4.2)	45(4.2)	9(3.1)	#(***)
2002 Nation (public)	9(0.2)*	246(0.8)*	44(1.1)*	56(1.1)*	14(0.9)	#(0.1)
Utah	9(0.5)	243(2.2)	47(4.0)	53(4.0)	11(2.9)	#(***)
2003 Nation (public)	11(0.2)	242(0.6)	48(0.8)	52(0.8)	13(0.6)	#(0.1)
Utah	10(0.7)	250(3.1)	39(4.5)	61(4.5)	20(3.2)	1(***)
2005 Nation (public)	11(0.1)	242(0.4)	49(0.6)	51(0.6)	12(0.4)	#(0.1)
Utah	9(0.5)	246(1.9)	46(3.3)	54(3.3)	13(2.4)	1(***)

Estimate rounds to zero.

* Value is significantly different from the value for the same jurisdiction in 2005.

¹ Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

NOTE: The NAEP reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Achievement levels correspond to the following points on the NAEP reading scale: below *Basic*, 242 or lower; *Basic*, 243–280; *Proficient*, 281–322; and *Advanced*, 323 and above. All differences were tested for statistical significance at the 0.05 level using unrounded numbers. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding. Performance comparisons may be affected by differences in exclusion rates for students with disabilities and English language learners in the NAEP samples and by changes in sample sizes.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1998–2005 Reading Assessments.

Where to Find More Information

The NAEP Reading Assessment

The latest news about the NAEP 2005 reading assessment and the national results can be found on the NAEP website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results/>. The individual snapshot reports for each participating state and other jurisdictions are also available in the state results section of the website at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/>.

The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2005 may be ordered or downloaded from the NAEP website.

The *Reading Framework for the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress*, on which this assessment is based, is available at the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) website (http://www.nagb.org/pubs/r_framework_05/761507-ReadingFramework.pdf).

Additional Results from the Reading Assessment

For more findings from the 2005 reading assessments, refer to the NAEP 2005 results at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>. The interactive database at this site includes student, teacher, and school variables for all participating states and other jurisdictions, the nation, and the four regions. Data tables are also available for each jurisdiction, with all background questions cross-tabulated with the major demographic variables. Users can design and create tables and can perform tests of statistical significance at this website.

Technical Documentation

For explanations of NAEP survey procedures, see: Allen, N.L., Donoghue, J.R., and Schoeps, T.L. (2001). *The NAEP 1998 Technical Report*. (NCES 2001–509). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics. Technical information may also be found on the NAEP website at (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results2003/interpret-results.asp>).

Publications on the inclusion of students with disabilities and limited-English-proficient students

Olson, J.F., and Goldstein, A.A. (1997). *The Inclusion of Students With Disabilities and Limited-English-Proficient Students in Large-Scale Assessments: A Summary of Recent Progress* (NCES 97–482). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.

Mazzeo, J., Carlson, J.E., Voelkl, K.E., and Lutkus, A.D. (2000). *Increasing the Participation of Special-Needs Students in NAEP: A Report on 1996 Research Activities* (NCES 2000–473). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.

Lutkus, A.D., and Mazzeo, J. (2003). *Including Special-Needs Students in the NAEP 1998 Reading Assessment, Part I: Comparison of Overall Results With and Without Accommodations* (NCES 2003–467). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.

Lutkus, A.D. (2004). *Including Special-Needs Students in the NAEP 1998 Reading Assessment, Part II: Results for Students With Disabilities and Limited-English-Proficient Students* (ETS-NAEP 04-R01). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

To Order Publications

Recent NAEP publications related to mathematics are listed on the mathematics page of the NAEP website and are available electronically. Publications can also be ordered from:

Education Publications Center (ED Pubs)
U.S. Department of Education
P.O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794–1398

Call toll free: 1-877-4ED Pubs (1-877-433-7827)
TTY/TDD: 1-877-576-7734
FAX: 1-301-470-1244

The NAEP State Report Generator was developed for the NAEP 2005 reports by Phillip Leung, Anthony Lutkus, Paul Gazzillo, Mike Narcowich, Nancy Mead, Arlene Weiner, Linda Myers, Mary Daane, and Bobby Rampey.

What is the Nation's Report Card?

The Nation's Report Card, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), is a nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. Since 1969, assessments have been conducted periodically in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography, and other fields. By making objective information on student performance available to policymakers at the national, state, and local levels, NAEP is an integral part of our nation's evaluation of the condition and progress of education. Only information related to academic achievement is collected under this program. NAEP guarantees the privacy of individual students and their families.

NAEP is a congressionally mandated project of the National Center for Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible, by law, for carrying out the NAEP project through competitive awards to qualified organizations.

In 1988, Congress established the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to oversee and set policy for NAEP. The Board is responsible for selecting the subject areas to be assessed; setting appropriate student achievement levels; developing assessment objectives and test specifications; developing a process for the review of the assessment; designing the assessment methodology; developing guidelines for reporting and disseminating NAEP results; developing standards and procedures for interstate, regional, and national comparisons; determining the appropriateness of all assessment items and ensuring the assessment items are free from bias and are secular, neutral, and non-ideological; taking actions to improve the form, content, use, and reporting of results of the National Assessment; and planning and executing the initial public release of NAEP reports.

The National Assessment Governing Board	
<p>Darvin M. Winick, Chair President Winick & Associates Dickinson, Texas</p> <p>Sheila M. Ford, Vice Chair Principal Horace Mann Elementary School Washington, D.C.</p> <p>Francie Alexander Chief Academic Officer Scholastic, Inc. Senior Vice President Scholastic Education New York, New York</p> <p>David J. Alukonis Chairman Hudson School Board Hudson, New Hampshire</p> <p>Amanda P. Avallone Assistant Principal and Eighth-Grade Teacher Summit Middle School Boulder, Colorado</p> <p>Honorable Jeb Bush Governor of Florida Tallahassee, Florida</p> <p>Barbara Byrd-Bennett Chief Executive Officer Cleveland Municipal School District Cleveland, Ohio</p> <p>Carl A. Cohn Clinical Professor Rossier School of Education University of Southern California Los Angeles, California</p>	<p>Honorable Keith King Member Colorado House of Representatives Colorado Springs, Colorado</p> <p>Kim Kozbial-Hess Fourth-Grade Teacher Fall-Meyer Elementary School Toledo, Ohio</p> <p>Andrew C. Porter Director Learning Sciences Institute Vanderbilt University, Peabody College Nashville, Tennessee</p> <p>Luis A. Ramos Community Relations Manager PPL Susquehanna Berwick, Pennsylvania</p> <p>Mark D. Reckase Professor Measurement and Quantitative Methods Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan</p> <p>John H. Stevens Executive Director Texas Business and Education Coalition Austin, Texas</p> <p>Mary Frances Taymans, SND Executive Director National Catholic Educational Association Washington, D.C.</p> <p>Oscar A. Troncoso Principal Socorro High School Socorro Independent School District El Paso, Texas</p>

Shirley V. Dickson

Educational Consultant
Laguna Niguel, California

John Q. Easton

Executive Director
Consortium on Chicago School Research
Chicago, Illinois

Honorable Dwight Evans

Member
Pennsylvania House of Representatives
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

David W. Gordon

Sacramento County
Superintendent of Schools
Sacramento County Office of Education
Sacramento, California

Kathi M. King

Twelfth-Grade Teacher
Messalonskee High School
Oakland, Maine

Honorable Thomas J. Vilsack

Governor of Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa

Michael E. Ward

Former State Superintendent of Public Instruction
North Carolina Public Schools
Jackson, Mississippi

Eileen L. Weiser

Member, State Board of Education
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

Grover J. Whitehurst (Ex-officio)

Director
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

Charles E. Smith

Executive Director, NAGB
Washington, D.C.